



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REPORTS.

ANGLIA. Herausgegeben von R. P. WÜLCKER und M. TRAUTMANN. VI  
Band, 3 u. 4 Hefte. Halle, 1883.

### VI 3.

P. Lefèvre begins this number with a long article on The Old English [Anglo-Saxon] Poem of Saint Guthlac, another contribution to the Cynewulf question. After a brief résumé of the preceding articles on this question, which are already known to the readers of this Journal, he investigates the authorship of the Guthlac by comparing it with the Riddles 1-60, Juliana, Christ, Elene, Vision of the Cross, and Phoenix, regarded as genuine works of Cynewulf, and with the Riddles 61-89, Andreas, and Descent into Hell, regarded as probable works of Cynewulf, the first place, however, being given to the universally acknowledged Juliana, Christ, and Elene. The investigation proceeds from a study of the metre, vocabulary and phraseology, characteristic passages, and composition and relation to its source, which is, from verse 501, the Latin Life of St. Guthlac, by Felix of Croyland. Rieger had assumed two divisions of the poem, 1-790, and 791 to the end, and this division had been accepted by Charitius in his article on the Guthlac (Anglia II), but Lefèvre prefers to make three divisions, 1-500, 501-790, and 791 to the end. After a very full investigation, from the points of view above mentioned, and a careful analysis of each of the three parts of the poem, Lefèvre comes to the conclusion that the three parts of the poem are the work of *one* author, thus differing from Charitius, who had regarded the third part alone as by Cynewulf (791 to end). Lefèvre considers the third part as distinguished from the others by greater perfection of form, but thinks that this proves only that it was written later than the others, and that Dietrich's date for the composition of the poem (760 A. D.) is too late for the first and second parts (1-790), which together form a connected whole. An appendix to the article contains a full conspectus of the *rime* in Cynewulf, as it appears in all of the above-mentioned poems.

A. Ebert compares briefly the Anglo-Saxon Physiologus with two Latin Physiologi in Berne MSS (B and C) of the ninth century, in the first of which the same animals occur, and in the same order, as in the single Anglo-Saxon MS, namely, the Panther, the Whale, and the Bird, called by Grein the Part-ridge. It appears from the comparison that the Anglo-Saxon Physiologus is but a fragment of the much fuller Latin Physiologus, the Panther being the twenty-third animal, and seven others following it, in MS B.

F. Groschopp treats the Anglo-Saxon poem 'Christ and Satan,' being the second book of the so-called poems of Caedmon. After a brief notice of the MS and of the editions of Junius, Thorpe, Bouterwek, and Grein, he considers the poem from both a literary and a grammatical standpoint. Ten

Brink's division into three independent poems (1-365, 366-664, and 665-733) is not approved, but Groschopp thinks a connection runs through the three parts of the poem, and that they may be regarded as the fragments of a single larger poem which a restorer, by certain additions, has attempted to unite again into one whole. After a synopsis of the contents of each part of the poem, he cites the expressions common to each part, and notwithstanding the lyrical tone of the first part as compared with the more epical tone of the second, he infers, from the agreement in vocabulary and style, and in poetical treatment of the subjects, that they form *one* poem, and that it is not impossible that it is one of Caedmon's poems, though it stands in no relation to Genesis, Exodus and Daniel. The examination of the grammar, both phonology and inflection, shows that, while the poem is written in the West-Saxon dialect, the irregularities point to the Kentish dialect, the copyist being probably from Kent.

J. L. Cheney, writing in English, investigates The Sources of Tindale's New Testament. He first states the views that have been held on the subject, though it would scarcely seem necessary to notice the erroneous and antiquated view of Hallam, or even those of Froude and Green, alongside of that of such a textual critic as the late Dr. Tregelles. Cheney uses in his collation the first edition of Tindale, printed at Worms, 1526, along with the chapters of Matthew printed at Cologne, 1525, the first portion of the New Testament ever printed in English, indicating also the variations of the edition of 1534 and of that of 1534-35 (G. H.) The Greek text of Erasmus's *third* edition, and his Latin version, along with the Vulgate text as given in his *fourth* edition, are used, but Cheney omits to give the dates of the different editions of Erasmus. The Luther version used is that of Sept. 1522, and that of Dec. 1522. The Wiclif text used is that of Forshall and Madden, Oxford, 1850, but no distinction is made between the earlier and later versions, Wiclif and Purvey. Cheney has compared St. Matthew 2-7, Romans 1-6, Galatians, Titus, Philemon, Revelation 1-6, and the Epistles of St. John, thirty-five chapters in all, of which only St. Matthew 2-7, and Galatians, twelve chapters (328 passages), are printed in Anglia. The general conclusion is "that Tindale's Testaments show traces of the influence of the four versions," inconsiderable as regards Wiclif and the Vulgate, and much greater as regards Erasmus than Luther, and of Erasmus the Latin, as well as the Greek, was followed, and the Latin, at times, preferred. Dr. Tregelles, however, had said: "That Tyndale's translation was made from the Greek, no one can question"; and "further, the translation was made from the Greek and not the Latin of Erasmus." It seems to me that Cheney has added "Erasmus Latin" after certain passages, where Tyndale's English is as accurate a translation of the Greek as of the Latin, *e. g.*, "Galatians V 19, aduoutrie, Er. *μοιχεία*, adulterium." The article is, however, another testimony to the independence of Tyndale, and a suitable tribute to the memory of the great translator and martyr. Cheney rightly says: "The Revised Version of 1881, it is interesting to note, returns in several cases to the translation made by Tindale, but altered by later revisions." It is to be hoped that some scholar will investigate all the passages in which this has been done, and thus accumulate evidence as to how much we are indebted to Tyndale for our present English Bible.

F. Voges discusses at length The Reflexive Dative in English, and supplies, to my mind, the weightiest article in this number. He briefly mentions a few English grammars, from Hickes to Earle, which notice this well-marked locution either very cursorily or not at all. He then separates "the *pleonastic* dative" into two strongly distinguished classes: 1. The so-called *ethical* dative, as in "One Colonna cuts *me* the throat of Orsini's baker," (Bulwer, Rienzi I 3), and so frequent in Shakspeare. 2. The *reflexive* dative, as in "Hie *thee* on thy steed" (*ib.* IV 2). The first is unquestionably a dative, but in the second class this is often very uncertain. Maetzner and Fiedler-Sachs mingle the two classes, and Koch mentions the *ethical* dative very briefly. Voges well remarks that the term "pleonastic" applied to both cases must be taken *cum grano salis*, for while the pronoun may be omitted without injuring the construction, it is never used without a purpose. The use of this *reflexive* dative has much diminished in the course of time: it was originally used chiefly with intransitive verbs, but the usage was early extended to transitive verbs. It is similar to the *ethical* dative, but there are important differences, the most noticeable of which is that in the *reflexive* dative the pronoun must be of like person, gender and number with the subject, while in the *ethical* dative it is generally different. After further discussion of the idiom, Voges notes two kinds of reflexive use of the pronoun: 1, with transitive verbs, always in the accusative, and 2, with intransitive verbs, generally in the dative. The different forms of the personal pronouns in Old English (Anglo-Saxon), Middle English, and Modern English, are next commented on, and then follows the bulk of the article, consisting of lists of verbs which are construed with the *reflexive* dative, with numerous examples from each of the three periods of the language, divided into the four classes, verbs of rest, of bodily movement, of mental emotions, and lastly, all those which cannot be brought under any one of these classes. The first class contains eight verbs, the second twenty-five, the third six, and the fourth eighty, including transitive and intransitive verbs, and those of Anglo-Saxon, Old Norse and Old French origin, forming forty-two pages of examples from the earliest times to the present. Only by such historical studies of English idioms can the grammar of the language ever be explained, but English scholars seem to leave it to Germans to make them.

K. Borchard has a long article on the History of the Text of Thomson's Seasons, considered in three sections, The Seasons before 1730, from 1730 to 1746, and since 1746. The first section notices briefly Thomson's literary activity to the publication of the first complete edition of The Seasons in 1730. The second section discusses at length the other editions published during Thomson's life, those of 1738, 1744, and 1746, noticing especially the numerous grammatical, stylistic and metrical changes made by Thomson between 1738 and 1744, as well as the additions, omissions and re-arrangements. The writer agrees with Cunningham (in Athenaeum, 1847) as against Mitford (in Gentleman's Magazine, 1841), that "the numerous emendations and alterations" made in a "small and beautiful writing" in Mitford's copy of the edition of 1738 were made by Lord Lyttelton and not by Pope. Some changes were also made by Thomson between 1744 and 1746, but they were not near so numerous or important as the preceding. The third section notices briefly the leading editions since 1746, especially those of Lord Lyttelton (1750), Murdoch (1762),

and Sir Harris Nicolas, the Aldine edition (1830, 1845, 1847), re-edited by Cunningham (1860). The section closes with a table showing the variations in number of lines of each poem in the principal editions.

G. E. MacLean presents a dissertation in English on Aelfric's Version of Alcuin's *Interrogationes Sigewulfi* in Genesin, most probably a doctor's dissertation. The brief general introduction treats the authors and their works, showing that the Abbot Aelfric (c. 1000 A. D.) translated into Anglo-Saxon a portion of Alcuin's "Handbook upon Genesis," written in answer to certain questions on that book, propounded by his pupil Sigewulf. Aelfric abridged the 280 questions and answers of Alcuin to 69. The critical introduction discusses at length the A. S. text and its MSS, of which there are *five*, one having heretofore been counted twice, the so-called C<sup>1</sup> belonging really to Codex C, as MacLean has shown. These MSS are each carefully described and compared, as well as the Latin MS, and Bouterwek's printed copy of MS M, the oldest MS, of which MS c is but a copy. The textual comparison notes "the possible intentional alterations, the probable clerical variations, and the phonological variations," with a careful summary of the last, showing that, while all the MSS are clearly Late West Saxon, M is the purest, B next, and C next, with a few earlier forms and perhaps a slight trace of Mercian influence. MS b has a Mercian coloring, though this may mark only the transition period, and c is merely a copy of M, with several late forms. The Creed and Doxology, appended to the work in MSS C and b, are regarded by MacLean as authentic. The authorship of the work is next discussed, and the conclusion reached, from opinions of critics, external and internal evidence, style and subject, that the work was written by Aelfric and no one else. His sources were Alcuin and Bede, with traces of Gregory the Great and Isidore. The A. S. text, with notes, will follow in a subsequent number.<sup>1</sup>

This number closes with an explanatory note of thanks to Prof. Sievers by J. Platt; an exhortation of Mr. J. Platt by H. Sweet, for having made use of the latter's unpublished 'Oldest Texts' in his article 'Angelsaechsisches' (*Anglia* VI 1), when he had it only to make extracts for the Philological Society's English Dictionary; and a note by R. Wülcker, to the effect that in his review of Furnivall's *Digby Mysteries* (*Anglia* VI 2) he had overlooked the fact that two of them were already printed in *Reliquiae Antiquae* II, though not so accurately as in Furnivall's edition.

#### VI 4.

This number of the *Anzeiger* begins with a full bibliography of the books and essays in English philology which have appeared during the years 1880, 1881, and 1882, by F. Lüns. Reviews follow, and then short original essays, as the *Anzeiger* will, in future, contain such essays, the longer ones being reserved for the principal numbers. The contents of this number are as follows:

L. Morsbach reviews F. J. Furnivall's *Fifty Earliest English Wills in the Court of Probate*, London, A. D. 1387-1439, with a Priest's of 1454, E. E. T. Society, 1882; J. Koch, *Chaucer Society Publications*, First Series LXIII and LXIV, being a Parallel-Text Print of Chaucer's *Troilus* and *Crisseyde*, Parts I

<sup>1</sup> It has been printed in *Anglia* VII 1.

and II, 1881-2; also Max Lange's *Untersuchungen über Chaucer's Boke of the Duchesse*, Halle, 1883; and R. Merbot's *Aesthetische Studien zur angelsächsischen Poesie*, Breslau, 1883. M. Trautmann very briefly notices G. Tanger's school-edition of *Christmas* from W. Irving's *Sketch-Book*, Leipzig, 1883; E. Holthaus reviews W. W. Skeat's *Aelfric's Lives of Saints*, Part I, E. E. T. Society, 1881; and J. Schipper, Miss L. T. Smith's edition of *Gorboduc*, in *Englische Sprach- und Literaturdenkmale des 16, 17 und 18 Jahrhunderts*, Heilbronn, 1883; and J. M. Garnett's *Translation of Beowulf*: Boston, Ginn, Heath & Co., 1882.

Under *Verschiedenes* come four short essays: G. Tanger, *Collation des Pariser Altenglischen Psalters mit Thorpe's Ausgabe*; R. Wülcker, *Über Bulwer's Jugendwerke*, I: *Bulwer's Weeds and Wildflowers*; L. Morsbach, *Zu Byron's Prisoner of Chillon*; and M. Trautmann, *Cynewulf und die Rätsel*, in which he contends against the heretofore almost universally acknowledged Cynewulfian authorship of the Riddles, if not of all, at least of a part. Trautmann thinks that the friends of this view must bring better proofs than they have heretofore brought, and especially must show a more complete agreement "in sprachlichen dingen" between the Riddles and the undoubted poems of Cynewulf than Dietrich has shown in *Z. für D. A.*, XII 246-47, and must compare the verse also. He adds: "So weit ich bis jetzt die rätsel mit den sicheren dichtungen Cynewulf's in sprachlicher und metrischer hinsicht zusammengehalten habe, ist freilich so gut wie kein grund vorhanden, ihm die rätsel in ihrer gesammtheit oder auch nur zu einem beträchtlichen theile zuzusprechen." The three groups of Riddles in the *Codex Exonensis* are regarded as originally *one* collection, consisting possibly of a hundred riddles.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

---

MNEMOSYNE, Vol. XI, Pt. 2.

The first article in this part, pp. 113-21, contains the continuation of van Herwerden's notes on Apollonius Rhodius. There is hardly anything in them which it is worth while to record here as being of general interest. On iii 773, where Medea wishes she had died *πρὶν Ἀχαιίδα γαῖαν ἰκέσθαι* | *Χαλκιδίπης νῆας*, H. remarks that "Phrixi filii, de quibus hic sermo est, susceperant quidem iter in Graeciam, sed incidentes in Argonautas nondum longe progressi cum his in Aeaëam reverterant, neque igitur Ἀχαιίδα γαῖαν ἵκοντο." He therefore proposes to read *ἴεσθαι*, "in Graeciam tenderent," as in Homer we have *ἴεσθαι* used with *οἴκαδε*, *ἐρεβόσδε*, etc. It is not necessary, he thinks, in this poet to make the further change Ἀχαιῖδ ἔς αἶαν, "quia nudus Accusativus a poetis saepissime conjungitur verbis eundi. Homerus sane posuisset Genetivum, sed quominus Apollonius eius exemplum sequeretur obstabant numeri." In iii 947 and iv 1591, *σχεδόν* is used in the sense of *statim*, "ut alibi *αὐτοσχεδόν* et *παρασχεδόν* usurpare assolet. Moneo propter lexicorum conditores, qui hanc vocabuli potestatem non commemorarunt." On iv 50, *οὐ γὰρ ἄνδρις* | *ἦεν ὀδῶν*, H. is reminded of Eur. *Hel.* 1041, where he proposes to read *ὀδῶν ἀπειροί* in place of the meaningless *πεδίων*. The preceding line begins with *πείσαιμι*. "Librarius, ni fallor, errore scribere coeperat vocabuli, quod praegressum versum orditur, primas litteras ΠΕ, unde nata erat portentosa lectio *πεοδων*, quae deinde infelici coniectura in *πεδίων* reficta est."

We have next, pp. 122–60, the continuation of Cobet's notes on Stein's Herodotus. On ii 2 he commends Stein for adopting from the Vat. MS *ἐπαγινέειν* for *ἐπάγειν*. "Quis serio credet *ἐπαγινέειν* pro *ἐπάγειν* e Graeculi coniectura esse natum? Profecto non Steinius, qui antiquam formam optimo iure recepit in textum." On ii 3, where we are told, with regard to the experiment of Psammetichus as to the primitive language, that *Ἕλληνες λέγουσι ἄλλα μάταια πολλά*, and that the king put them in charge of women *τὰς γλώσσας ἑκταμῶν*, he writes: "quis credat Graecos sermones in patria inter se caedere de Psammeticho et vetustis Aegyptiorum fabulis? Dicuntur haec et similia de iis qui ante Herodotum historiam scripserunt et imprimis de Hecataeo Milesio." So on ii 15 *εἰ βουλόμεθα γνώμῃσι τῇσι Ἰώνων χρᾶσθαι* he explains: "id est *si Hecataei Milesii auctoritatem sequi volumus*, eleganter dictum pro: *si quid Hecataeo credimus*, quem deinde acute refutat et tantum non deridet." On the same chapter, ii 3, he writes *Ἡλίου πόλιν* but *Ἡλιοπολιται*: for "constantissime veteres omnes in talibus nomen urbis scribebant κατὰ παράθεσιν, Νέα πόλιν, Μεγάλη πόλιν (et sic Ἄρειος πάγος, ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός), sed civium nomen κατὰ σύνθεσιν, Νεοπολίτης, Μεγαλοπολίτης (Ἀρεοπαγίτης, ἀνδραγαθία)." In ii 25 the editors "mordicus retinent," the reading *ὑετώτατοι*, though Schweighauser divined the true *ὑετιώτεροι* which is found in A: "mirificum est commentum Lobeckii a Dindorfio laudatum: '*mihī substantiva ὑετός, ἔμετος, κάπετος*, etc., *adiectivorum ad naturam tam prope accedere videntur ut comparativos non admodum mirer*.' Haud vidi magis. Stein quoque barbarum *ὑετώτατοι* fideliter servavit. Ὑετός, ἔμετος, etc., non magis adiectiva sunt quam *πυρετός, σκελετός, ὀχετός, νιφετός, κοπετός, ἀροτος (ἀρόυν), ἀμητος (ἀμῶν), θάνατος, κάματος*, et similia." In ii 39 Stein retains *πυρὴν καίονσι*, instead of adopting Bekker's correction of *πῦρ ἀνακαίονσι*, which occurs in i 132, viii 19. "Manifestum tenemus correctorem, qui quum haberet ob oculos ΠΥΡΑΝΑ-καίονσι sibi videre visus est *πυρὴν καίονσι* et Ionicum *πυρὴν* de suo dedit." On ii 69 where Stein gives *ἀποθανόντας (τοὺς κροκοδείλους) θάπτονται ταριχεύΟΝτες ἐν ἱρῇσι θήκησι*, the reading of the Vat. *ταριχεύΣΑΝτες* should be adopted, "quia non poterant simul mortuos condire et sepelire. Sexcenties participia praesentis et praeteriti temporis sic temere inter se confunduntur. Non est tamen unquam anceps optio. Ex ipsa rei natura dicitur *γελῶν ἀπῆλθε*, quia simul ridebat et abibat, sed *γελάσας εἶπε*, quia nemo simul ridere et loqui potest." The passage, in which Hdt. confesses that he saw no more of the phoenix than its picture, is quoted, and Cobet remarks—not exactly in the tone of Prof. Sayce on the same chapter—"agnoscimus in his Herodoti candorem et veri amorem—omnino satius est sacerdotibus (in Aegypto quidem) nihil credere"; and the same chapter gives another occasion for changing the pres. into the aor. partic., "non poterat phoenix *simul* τὸν πατέρα σμύρνη ἐμπλάσσειν καὶ κομίζειν." On ii 147, where Stein has *ἐστήσαντο δνῶδεκα βασιλέας ἐς δνῶδεκα μοίρας δασάμενοι Αἰγυπτον πᾶσαν*, he writes: "veteres et probati scriptores verbis *dividendi et partiendi* non addunt praepositionem. Itaque *in partes duodecim dividerunt Aegyptum* Graece sonat: *δνῶδεκα μοίρας ἐδάσαντο Αἰγυπτον πᾶσαν*, cf. vii 121: *τρεῖς μοίρας ὁ Ξέρξης δασάμενος ἵπαντα τὸν πεζὸν στρατόν*. Sic libri omnes." In ii 162 we have: *κατελάμβανε τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους, ταῦτα μὴ ποιεῖν λέγοντος αὐτοῦ τῶν τις Αἰγυπτίων . . . περιέθηκε οἱ κυνήν*. "Male divisa haec sunt. Herodotus coniunxerat *κατελάμβανε ταῦτα μὴ ποιεῖν*. Namque

καταλαμβάνειν τινά est *abire* aut *progredi volentem* retinere. Amasis *dehortabatur Aegyptios ne id facerent, et dum verba fecit unus capiti eius coronam imponit*. Quia καταλάμβανε idem est quod ἀπηγόρευε, propterea quemadmodum dicitur ἀπηγόρευε μὴ ποιεῖν, sic hoc loco καταλάμβανε ταῦτα μὴ ποιεῖν." This greatly improves the structure; but one would like to see another example of this use of καταλαμβάνειν.

At the end of his notes on this book, Cobet again maintains the veracity of Herodotus against his slanderers. He quotes a passage in which Strabo mocks him in regard to the account, in ii 28, of the sources of the Nile. "Comparato loco Herodoti, unde haec sumta sunt, Straboni, sat scio, subirasceris. Nihil enim huiusmodi pro veris Herodotus narrat sed audivisse se dicit ea in urbe Sai a quaestore pecuniae sacrae, οὗτος δ' ἔμοιγε παίζειν ἐδόκεε, inquit. Nihilo magis credebatur τὰς πηγὰς τοῦ Νείλου εἶναι ἄβυσσους. Prudenter Herodotus: *si quidem*, inquit, haec vera narrabat, εἰ ἄρα ταῦτα γενόμενα ἔλεγε, suspicor illo loco fuisse δῖνας τινὰς ἰσχυρὰς καὶ παλιρροίην, ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι κατιεμένην καταπειρητήριον εἰς βύσσον ἵεναι. Potuitne Strabo melius quam his refutari? Neque Strabo neque ceteri Herodoti reprehensores recordati sunt eorum quae historiae parens scripsit ii 123: τοῖσι μὲν νῦν ὑπ' Αἰγυπτίων λεγομένοιαι χράσθω ὅτεφ' τὰ τοιαῦτα πιθανά ἐστι, ἐμοὶ ΔΕ παρὰ πάντα τὸν λόγον ὑποκέεται ὅτι τὰ λεγόμενα ὑπ' ἐκάστων ἀκοῇ γράφω.

The next article, pp. 161-89, is by Naber, entitled "De Aristophanis Nubibus." He begins by saying: "saepe mirari soleo in plerisque Aristophanis fabulis, in Vespis, in Nubibus, in Pluto, in Ranis, in Pace, qui factum sit, ut compositio tam sit imperfecta; singulae partes eximia arte expolitae sunt et summo poeta dignissimae; sed ἡ τῶν ὅλων σύντασις incredibiliter claudicat." The reason is not, as he thinks, that Wolf was right in his dictum "sero Graecis in poesi didicisse *totum ponere*,"—"equidem nunquam adducar ut credam, bonum poetam, qualem Aristophanem fuisse novimus, non meliorem exitum fabulae invenire potuisse, quam eum qui perabsurde in Vespis pro clausula est." But though Wolf only hinted at the difficulty without solving it, his disciple Boeckh discussed the integrity of the extant tragedies with admirable insight, "sed Aristophanem et Comoediam Graecam non complexus est. Huius igitur vestigiis insistentes, age exploremus num ea quae supersunt et genuina omnia sint et forma primitiva servata; sed ut tandem pervenire possimus eo quo tendimus, primum explicandum est quid sit fabulam *retractare* vel *διασκενάζειν*." To explain this, among other passages, this of Galen is quoted: "ἐπιδισκευνάσθαι λέγεται βιβλίον ἐπὶ τῷ προτέρῳ γεγραμμένῳ τὸ δεύτερον γραφέν, ὅταν τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἔχον τὴν αὐτὴν καὶ τὰς πλείστας τῶν ῥήσεων τὰς αὐτάς, τινὰ μὲν ἀφηρημένα ἐκ τοῦ προτέρου γράμματος ἔχει, τινὰ δὲ προσκείμενα, τινὰ δὲ ὑπὸ πηλαγμένα, παράδειγμα δ' εἰ βούλει τοῦτον σαφηνείας ἕνεκα τὸν δεύτερον Ἀντόλῳ-κον Εὐπόλιδος ἔχεις ἐκ τοῦ προτέρου δισκευασμένον." A better example for us will be the Nubes, with regard to which N. expects to show that "superest hodie . . . *prior* editio, cui ex *altera* editione quaedam non nimis apte assuta sunt." The beginning even of this demonstration is not forthcoming in the present article, which, it must be confessed, is of a somewhat rambling character, and does not consent to be epitomized; though there are a good many interesting matters touched upon in it, of which some may be quoted. "Plurimum interest inter διασκευὴν et διόρθωσιν, nam ὁ διασκευαστὴς ipsum



librum retractat et corrigendo argumentum aliquatenus diversum facit, ὁ διορθωτής autem leviora menda procurat ut sententiae lenius decurrant et bellum gerit adversus librariorum negligentiam. Si quis suum ipse librum διορθοί, minuta et pusilla emendat, sed ὁ διασκευαστής hoc agit, ut fere novus liber exeat." There is evidence that, occasionally, poets wrote not what they thought best, but what would suit particular actors, as Aristotle tells us that certain plays contain ἐπεισόδια which succeed one another without necessity or probability. Such dramas are composed "ὑπὸ μὲν φάβλων ποιητῶν δι' αὐτούς, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν ἀγαθῶν διὰ τοὺς ὑποκριτάς· ἀγωνίσματα γὰρ ποιοῦντες καὶ παρὰ δύναμιν παρατείνοντες πολλὰκις ἀναγκάζονται διαστρέφειν τὸ ἐφεξῆς." There is evidence also that actors altered texts for their own convenience, as the schol. writes on one passage of the true reading, μετέπλασαν διὰ τὸ διέκφορον, and what had thus been heard in the theatre was very likely to make its way into the texts; for as Boeckh says: "paucos tum dramatum codices habebant; audiebantur magis quam legebantur." We have then remarks on the practice of the Roman adapters of Greek plays, with quotations from Terence; where it may be permitted to remark that Naber does not seem to be at his best in the prosody of the Latin comic poets; for he quotes two lines which cannot be made to scan and which do not appear as he prints them in the modern editions. To show that what Terence confesses to have been his own practice is not so monstrous after all: "ipsam rem ne quis miretur, scito etiam hodie idem fieri, et adscribam recens exemplum, quod Paulo Lindavio debeo, qui ostendit Sardovii Odettam, quam nuper Parisienses plausu exceperunt, διασκευήν esse Marii Uchardi Flamminae, cui fabulae quaedam accessere ex Pauli Giacometti fabula *Culpa culpam vindicat*." He recurs now to the Greek poets and makes some interesting remarks about the Hippolytus. After quoting Valckenaer's opinion as to the relation of the second to the first edition, he says he partly agrees with it, but "iam ante triginta annos me tetigit suspicio de Phaedra summum virum errare, et nunc occasione oblata fortasse mihi concedetur ut tandem modeste ut decet significem cur ita putem. Primum retractatione fabula *δεσκευασμένη* non necessario fit melior, saepeque factum existimo quod Boeckhius scribit . . . 'in emendando fieri solet ut pro mendis quae deleas maiora committas.'" And then he goes on to give strong reasons for the opinion that in the original scheme of the play it was the nurse and not Phaedra who contrived that Theseus should find in the hand of his dead wife the letter accusing Hippolytus of crime. In particular he refers to the words of Artemis, l. 1310, ἡ δ' εἰς ἔλεγχον μὴ πέση φοβουμένη | ψευδεῖς γραφὰς ἔγραψε καὶ δῶλεσε | δόλοισι σὸν παῖδ' and shows that it is the τροφός who has been last spoken of, and that it was she "quae φοβουμένη μὴ πέσοι εἰς ἔλεγχον, h. e. μὴ βασανισθῇ, eam fraudem excogitavit." There is only one line, 1288, in which Phaedra is said to have written the letter, and these lines "nisi omnia me fallunt, accessere demum in altera editione." To confirm his opinion he quotes from Racine, who, after saying that he has toned down some features of his original, writes: "J'ai cru que la calomnie avait quelque chose de trop bas et de trop noir pour la mettre dans la bouche d'une Princesse, qui a d'ailleurs des sentimens si nobles et si vertueux. Cette bassesse m'a paru plus convenable à une Nourrice, qui pourrait avoir des inclinations plus serviles et qui néanmoins n'entreprend cette fausse accusation que pour sauver la vie et l'honneur de sa maîtresse."

The next article, pp. 190–202, is by Prof. Badham, on the eighth book of Plato's *Leges*, his notes on the seventh having already appeared in his edition of the *Philebus*. These criticisms involve a larger amount of quotation and discussion than is compatible with this notice. He says himself "si ostendere velero quot quantaque in Edd. nostris corruptelae etiam lateant, longiores aliquae *ρήσεις* erunt apponendae, praesertim quoniam saepe factum est ut orationis ambitus in singula membra prave dispertitus novis erroribus et futilibus supplementis occasionem praebuerit. Quid ergo? Num Platonis studiosi τὰ μήκη, dummodo πρὸς τὸν λόγον uerint, reformidaturi erant? Haud credo; itaque ab initio incipiamus." A single short example may be given. In p. 846d it is said that citizens must be left free from handicrafts that they may have leisure for their civil duties, τέχνην γὰρ ἱκανὴν πολλῆς ἀσκήσεως ἅμα καὶ μαθημάτων πολλῶν δεομένην κέκτηται πολίτης ἀνὴρ τὸν κοινὸν τῆς πόλεως κόσμον σώζων καὶ κτῶμενος, οὐκ ἐν παρέργῳ δεόμενον ἐπιτηδεύειν. "Ecquis Graece dici posse credit τοῦτο δέεται ἐπιτηδεύειν? Ipsum *curatoris egere* diceres. Sed facillima est correctio, κόσμον—οὐκ ἐν παρέργῳ δεχόμενον ἐπιτηδενΣΙΝ."

The last article, pp. 203–24, contains "Nova studia ad Antiphontem," by van Herwerden. The *Studia Antiphontea* recently published by I. I. Hartman in a program of the Leyden Gymnasium excited Herwerden to a renewed study of this orator, and he finds that Hartman, as well as Iernstedt and Blass, have left some obscurities still to be cleared up. Room may perhaps be found for a note on ι 17, ἡ οὖν παλλακὴ τοῦ Φιλόνεω ἡκολούθει τῆς θυσίας ἔνεκα. καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἦσαν ἐν τῷ Πειραιεῖ, οἷον εἰκὸς ἔθνον. καὶ ἐπειδὴ αὐτῷ (l. αὐτοῖς cum Iernst.) ἐπέθντο [τὰ ἱερὰ dele] ἐντεῦθεν ἐβουλεύετο ἡ ἀνθρωπος ὅπως (ἀν dele cum Hartm. sed praeterea requiro ὅποτε *quando*) αὐτοῖς τὸ φάρμακον δόη, πότερα πρὸ δείπνου ἢ ἀπὸ δείπνου. ἔδοξεν οὖν αὐτῇ βουλευομένη βέλτιον εἶναι ματὰ δείπνου δοῦναι, τῆς (l. ταῖς cum A. pr. et Cobeto) Κλυταιμνήστρας τῆς τοῦτον μητρὸς ὑποθήκαις ἅμα διακονοῦσα. "Correxerunt syntaxim eruditi rescribendo διακονοῦσαν, sed haud temere dixit Hartman se verba ἅμα διακονοῦσαν non intelligere. Neque ego hercle intelligo; nam ne hoc quidem, ut post coenam potius quam ante coenam venenum daret, Philonei uxor pellici suaserat. Sed optimam sententiam ista verba, scripta ut leguntur in libris, praebebunt, si mecum transposueris in paragraphi initium hoc modo: ἡ οὖν παλλακὴ τοῦ Φιλόνεω ἡκολούθει τῆς θυσίας ἔνεκα, ταῖς Κλυταιμνήστρας τῆς τοῦτον μητρὸς ὑποθήκαις ἅμα διακονοῦσα, i. e. *non solum festi causa, sed etiam* (ἅμα) *sic nacta occasionem obsequendi scelestae mulieris consiliis.*" On v 24, ἐπειδὴ δ' ὁ ἀνὴρ οὐτ' ἐν τῇ Μυτιλήνῃ ἔφαίνετο ζητούμενος οὐτ' ἄλλοθι οὐδαμῶς, he writes: "Hartmán: 'Mytilenem missus erat pedisequus qui nuntiaret Herodem exisse ex navi nec rediisse, non qui eum ibi quaereret.' Optime admonet, et iamdudum male me ea res habuit. Ubi vero quaeso hominem quaesituri erant praeterquam ubi ἀφανὴς ἐγένετο, i. e. in agro Methymnaeo? Cf. §21 et 23. Quare non dubito oratori aut reddendum esse ἐν τῇ Μηθυναίᾳ aut ἐν τῷ λιμένι, cl. §27 ζητούμενον δὲ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς δὴ ἡμέρας καὶ ἐν τῷ λιμένι καὶ ἀπῶθεν τοῦ λιμένος, quod fortasse etiam praestat. Fortasse in vetusto codice litterarum ΤΩΙ ΛΙΜΕΝΙ non nisi prima et posteriores aegre legi potuerunt, ita ut librarius T . . . ΔΗΝΗ dispicere sibi videretur, quae pro reliquiis nominis ΘΗ ΜΥΤΙΑΗΝΗ paulo ante lecti habuerit."

Vol. XI, Pt. 3.

This part opens (pp. 225-31) with a continuation of Herwerden's notes on Hartman's *Studia Antiphontea*. In VI 21, the common text gives ἀναβὰς ἐγὼ εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον τοῖς αὐτοῖς δικάσαις ἐλεξα, ὅτι τὸν μὲν νόμον οὐ δίκαιον οὐ προκαθισταῖ Φιλοκράτης κατηγορῶν καὶ διαβάλλων εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον, μελλόντων ἐσθθαι μοι ἀγώνων πρὸς Ἀριστίωνα καὶ Φιλίνον αὔριον καὶ τῇ ἐνῃ. "Verba funditus depravata alii aliter tentarunt. Equidem suspicor: ὅτι τῶν μὲν νομίμων οὐ δικάσις (hucusque cum Dobreo) ἀμοιρόν με καθισταίη Φιλοκράτης, κτλ. Adiectivo ἀμοιρός ex pedestribus praeter Platonem usus est Demosthenes. Dobree: ὅτι τῶν μὲν νομίμων οὐ δικάσις προαγορεύει εἰργεσθαι Φιλ. Sed καθισταίη tam aptum est, ut corruptela natum esse parum sit probabile." §24: καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ δικάσαι καὶ ἕτεροι ἰδιῶται πολλοί. "Hartman 'si quid video, aut ἕτεροι aut ἰδιῶται eiciendum est.' At saepe ἕτερος et ἄλλος Graeci usurparunt, ubi nos cum Latinis utimur adverbio, quale est *praeterea*. Praesertim considerandi sunt poetarum loci qui propter metrum non potuerunt interpolari, ex quibus nunc memini loci Aristophanei ex Avibus vs. 152: ἀλλ' εἰσὶν ἕτεροι τῆς Λοκρίδος Ὀποιύντιοι, cf. Blaydes, ad Soph. Philoct. 38." §46: "Haesit Hartman in verbis: καίτοι ἱκανά γ' ἦν ὑπομνήσαι καὶ ἐνθυμηθῆναι, εἴπερ ἡδικοῦντο, ἀμφότερα καὶ σφῶν αὐτῶν ἔνεκα καὶ τῆς πόλεως. Optime dicitur ἱκανόν τί ἐστιν ὑπομνήσαι τινα, *idoneum est aliquod, quod aliquem moneat de aliqua re*, optime item ἱκανόν τί ἐστιν ἐνθυμηθῆναι (= ἐνθυμιον ποιήσασθαι) *idoneum est aliquid quod religioni habeas, quod religionem tibi incutiat*. Paullo sane liberior orator duas structuras aliquantum, fateor, diversas coniunxit, sed non satis hoc causae esse arbitror, cur verbum aptissimum et paene necessarium ἐνθυμηθῆναι cum Hartmano ei abiudicemus, tribuentes 'semi-docto,' quem quid movere potuerit ut id adscriberet, haudquam equidem assequor."

The next article (pp. 232-6) is by J. J. Cornelissen, on Cornelius Nepos. He expresses the pleasure with which he read Cobet's recent edition. "Ut appareret autem quanta cura quantoque studio Magistri praestantissimum opus persecutus et amplexus sim, pauculos annotavi locos, qui nondum ita editi viderentur, ut nullam corruptelae suspicionem moverent. Vix opus est monere in segete, ex qua COBETUS uberrimam quasi emendationum messem collegisset, mihi singulas tantum spiculas quasdam corradendas relictas esse." Of the corrections proposed, not many seem important, and only two or three nearly certain. In Them. i 3, *nam cum iudicasset sine summa industria non posse eam [contumeliam] extinguere, totum se dedit rei publicae*, he proposes *nisi* for *sine*. In Alc. VI 4, *postquam in astu venit, contione advocata sic verba fecit, ut nemo tam ferus fuerit quin eius casui illacrimaret*, he suggests *ferreus* for *ferus*. In Han. V 2, *obducta nocte sarmenta in cornibus iuvenorum deligata incendit eiusque generis multitudinem magnam dispalatam immisit*, he reads *dispalatum*, "ut Latinitati consulatur."

The next article (pp. 237-45) is by Badham, entitled *Paralipomena in Platonis Libris de Legibus I, II, III, IV*. One or two short extracts may be made. P. 653a: "Mox in ipsa τῆς παιδείας definitione misere turbata sunt omnia. Sed ex rei natura locus satis certe restitui potest: leg. παιδείαν δὴ λέγω τὴν παραγνομένην πρῶτον παισὶν ἀρετὴν, ὅταν ἡδονὴ τε καὶ φίλια καὶ λῆπη τε καὶ μῖσος ὀρθῶς ἐν ψυχῇς ἐγγένωνται μήπω δυναμένων λόγον λαμβάνειν, λαβόντι δὲ

τ. λ. ξυμφωνήσωσι, τῷ [λόγῳ] ὀρθῶς εἰθίσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν προσηκόντων ἐθῶν. Αὐτὴ δ' ἐστ' ἡ ξυμφωνία κτέ. 'etsi ipsi rationem nondum assecuti sunt, concordant cum eo qui hanc iam habet,' h. e. disciplina est assuefactio eorum, quae ratio post modo probabit." P. 659d: "Nemo unquam interpretabitur κατὰ μέλη δεῖ μεταχειρίζεσθαι . . . ταῖς ξυνηθείαις τοὺς ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι νέους. Lacunae signum ibi posui ubi sententia hiare videbatur. Aliquid huiusmodi intercidisse conicio: (οὕτως ὥστε ξυνήθεις γενέσθαι, καὶ μηδέποτε μηδὲν ἐναντίον ταύταις διδάσκεισθαι) ταῖς ξυνηθείαις τοὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει νέους."

J. J. Cornelissen follows (pp. 246-59) with notes 'Ad Scriptores Historiae Augustae,' as edited by Jordan and Eyssenhardt, 1863. These contain a large number of short verbal criticisms, but do not present any matter of general interest. The first may be taken as a specimen. Ael. Spartiani Hadrianus 7, *io ad honores explendos non solum amicis sed etiam passim aliquantis multa largitus est. Legendum est sed etiam passim aliis quamvis multa l. e.*" The corrections proposed are, in many cases, ingenious and exceedingly probable.

Cobet next devotes two pages to a "gravis Athenaei error in loco Timaei historici." Aelian, borrowing from the 12th book of Athenaeus, says that Smindyrides of Sybaris, when he came to woo Agariste, ἐπάγεσθαι χιλίους μὲν μαγειρούς τοσοῦτους δὲ ὀρνυθεντὰς καὶ ἀλιεῖς χιλίους. In Athenaeus himself we read: εἰποντο γοῦν αὐτῷ χίλιοι μάγειροι καὶ ὀρνυθενταί. Ἱστορεῖ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ Τιμαῖος ἐν τῇ ἐβδόμῃ. In another passage, Ath. says χιλίους συνεπήγετο οἰκέτας ἀλιεῖς καὶ ὀρνυθεντὰς καὶ μαγειρούς. So Aelian has tripled the number. "An igitur Timaeus haec deliramenta serio memoriae prodidit? minime gentium. Reprehenditur acerbè a Polybio et aliis, sed non insaniebat tamen. Sed quid cesso locupletem testem ipsum Timaeum producere, qui optime hoc crimen purgaturus est?" Then a passage from Diod. Sic., also borrowed from Timaeus, is cited, in which we learn that this suitor ἀναχθῆναι ἐκ Συβάρως ἐν πεντηκοντῶρ τοὺς ἐρέτας ἔχοντα ΙΔΙΟΥΣ οἰκέτας, ὧν εἶναι τοὺς μὲν ἀλιεῖς τοὺς δὲ ὀρνυθόθρας. As in other cases, so here, "Athenaeus dormitans, quum esset scriptum 'ΙΔΙΟΥΣ, sibi visus est ΧΙΔΙΟΥΣ videre. Decepit Aelianum, sed posthac neminem, ut spero, decepturus est."

In the next forty pages, Cobet contributes notes on Stein's edition of Herodotus, book III. There are some two hundred of them; and, though nearly all are worth attention, very few are of such general interest as to be available for this notice. But a few specimens may be quoted; III 7: *σάζαντες ὕδατι*. "Sic unus omnium Codex R pro *ἐλξαντες*, solus, ut tam saepe alibi, servans antiquam scripturam. Quod in libris est *ἐλξαντες* ne Graecum quidem est, nam *ἐλκω* habet futurum *ἐλξω*, sed aoristum *ἐλκυσα*, non *εἶλξα*, nisi apud ineptos scriptores sequioris aetatis, Philostratum similesque, qui et *εἶρψα* dicebant pro *εἶρυσσα*." III 22: "Post pauca ab R accipe οὐδὲν *ἔφη* θαυμάζειν pro *ἔφη* οὐδὲν. Non est enim Graecum *φημι* οὐ θαυμάζειν sed *οὐ φημι* θαυμάζειν. Ut οὐ φάναι est *negare*, οὐκ *ἔαν* *vetare*, οὐκ *ἀξιῶν* et οὐ *δικαιοῦν* *noīle*, οὐ *δοκεῖν* *dissimulare*, οὐ *συμβουλεύειν* *dissuadere*, ut VII 46, οὐ *συμβουλεύων* *Ξέρξη* *στρατεύεσθαι* ἐπὶ τὴν 'Ελλάδα." III 37: *ἐς τοῦ 'Ηφαίστου* τὸ ἱρὸν ἦλθε καὶ πολλὰ τῷ ἀγάλματι κατεγέλασε. Cf. III 38: "ἱροῖσι τε καὶ νομαίοισι . . . κατεγέλαν. III 155: *δεινόν τι* ποιεῖμενος Ἀσσυρίους Πέρσης καταγέλαν. IV 79: *ἡμῖν* καταγέλᾱτε. VII 9: Ἵωνας . . . οὐκ *ἔασεις* καταγέλασαι ἡμῖν. Sine controversia hi loci omnes labem

et vitium contraxerunt. Ubi κατὰ cum dativo iungi poterit, tum demum καταγελᾶν τινί pro τινός recte dictum erit. Vera ratio uno tantum loco reperitur V 68: ἐνθα καὶ πλείστον κατεγέλασε τῶν Σικυνωίων. Fieri potest ut veteres glossae ἐγχάσκειν, ἐγχανεῖν perierint, fieri potest ut verbum ἐμπαίζειν usurpaverit, fieri potest ut forma tragica ἐγγελᾶν τινί Herodotus usus fuerit, sed ut rectum sit τῷ ἀγάλματι κατεγέλασε et similia, id verò fieri non potest." III 38: ὁρθῶς μοι δοκεῖ Πίνδαρος ποιῆσαι νόμον πάντων βασιλέα [φῆσας] εἶναι. "Insitici-um et spurium est φῆσας additum ab eo qui quid esset ποιῆσαι (*in carmine dixisse*) non intellexerat. Vulgata significat: *recte fecit quod dixit*, sed non est haec Herodoti sententia." III 80: κῶς δ' ἂν εἴη χρῆμα κατηρτῆμένον μοναρχίη, τῇ ἐξεστὶ ἀνευθύνῃ ποιεῖν τὰ βούλεται: "Recte emendavit H. Stephanus κατηρτῆμένον, quod Stein ne commemoravit quidem, fortasse quia, ut Schweighauserus scribit: '*vulgatum tuentur libri omnes.*' Quasi vero quis nunc nesciat H et IΣ sexcenties in libris omnibus inter se permisceri. Equidem nego umquam Graecis verbum κατηρτᾶν in usu fuisse. Quidquid tamquam inde natum profertur lectiones sunt corruptae verborum ex κατηρτίζω natorum, ut κατηρτημένον pro κατηρτισμένον. Sic, V 106, pro κατηρτήσω in verbis ἵνα τοι κείνα πάντα κατηρτήσω ἐς τῶντό Reiske optime correxit κατηρτίσω ab omnibus probatum. In libro IX 66, Stein edidit ἤγε κατηρτημένως sprete unice vera scriptura, quam solus R habet κατηρτισμένως."

Pp. 303-22 are occupied by a continuation of Naber's article on the Nubes of Aristophanes. He finds some difficulty still in coming to the point, and begins by mentioning "exempla quaedam fabularum quas alii correxerunt et detulerunt in certamen," the details of which "unicuique facile est ex Meinekii Historia Critica conquirere." At last he says "Venio ad Aristophanem, qui ut alia taceam, bis dicitur docuisse Nubes et Plutum." As to the latter, it has been shown most recently and completely, by E. W. H. Brentano, that "duae fuerunt comoediae, quae praeter titulum et personam Pluti vix quidquam commune habuerunt, nostra autem fabula potissimum refert Plutum posteriorem, cui ex priore quaedam admixta sunt." Brentano thinks, however, "eas contaminationes ad Byzantina tempora detrudendas esse." This Naber considers altogether improbable, nor can he see "quidni τὴν διασκευὴν ad illa tempora referam, quae Aristophanis aetatem proxime secuta sunt." He attaches great weight to the fourth and sixth arguments, and infers from their statements that the first edition of the Clouds was a comparative failure, gaining only the third prize; that Aristophanes prepared an altered edition, which was represented within three or four years, but failed even more completely, and was, from that time, neglected by the poet, who "rediit ad primam recensionem, quam postea credibile est saepe fuisse actam. Hinc est factum ut hodie habeamus textum, qui Nubes priores potissimum refert, cum in aliis αἱ διασκευαὶ fere aetatem tulerint." The writer of the sixth argument had in his possession the play as we now have it, as well as the original edition, and carefully compared the two; but had no knowledge of the "Nubes posteriores," prepared by the poet himself, "quae propter causam quam dixi mature periissent." "Sequitur nos habere Nubes priores, quibus ex posterioribus Nubibus quaedam non nimis apte agglutinata sunt: haec origo est Nubium, quas *tertias* adeo dicere poterimus. Est autem probabilis suspicio, non ipsum poetam fabulam contaminatione, sed brevi post Aristophanem mortuum nescio quis contulit in unum

quae sibi in utraque fabula egregie placebant. Contaminata fabula in scena agi non potuit, quod omnes viderunt. . . . Priores Nubes norant omnes, posteriores latebant et postquam fabula semel spectata fuerat, eam Aristophanes oblivioni tradiderat. Unicum exemplar, quod forte supererat, invenit is, ad quem Aristophanis libri pervenerunt, filius, nepos, fortasse alius quidam: hic *lectorum* in gratiam contaminando tertiam fabulam fecit, quae postquam diu simul cum prioribus Nubibus circumlata fuit, tandem sola expetebatur, sola legebatur, sola denique salva ad nos pervenit propter eximiam disputationem inter τὸν δίκαιον et τὸν ἄδικον λόγον, quam in prioribus Nubibus lectores aegre desiderabant." It is assumed by Naber and by Brentano, whom he here follows, that the writer of the sixth argument correctly attributes to the second edition of the play the dispute between the two λόγοι. In order that this may be in accordance with the facts, as Naber takes them, it is necessary to expunge from Plato's *Apology* the thrice-made allusion to this, καὶ τὸν ἥττω λόγον κρείττω ποιεῖν. He shows some not very cogent reasons for thinking these words interpolated where they occur. He thus sums up the difference between the two plays as he conceives it: "In prioribus Nubibus Socrates et Chaerephon ridebantur propter ineptum naturae et grammaticae studium: ἄθροισμα sunt et ὑπόμωροι, sed minime mali. In posteriore comoedia Chaerephontis nullae partes fuerunt, Socrates autem exagitabatur et repraesentabatur tanquam omnium odio et contemtu dignus, quippe qui iuventutem corrumperet et artem teneret, qua posset ὁ ἥττων λόγος vincere τὸν κρείττονα. In priore fabula Socratis discipuli discunt λέγειν, sed si ea disciplina abutuntur, nihil hoc ad Socratem, cuius est perridicula docendi methodus, sed quae neminem corrumpet nisi qui iam ante corruptus hoc agat ut deterius corrumpatur. In secunda fabula Socrates merus est Sophista Protagorae instar." In the concluding portion of his paper, Naber endeavors to assign various parts of the existing play to the first or second edition, in accordance with these views. But in doing this he attributes some to the first edition which seem to imply the moral obliquity of Socrates' school, as much as other passages which are relegated to the second. *E. g.*, v. 99, διδάσκουσ' ἀργύριον ἢν τις διδῶ | λέγοντα νικᾶν καὶ δίκαια κᾶδῖκα.

H. W. van der Mey follows (pp. 323-31) with notes on Thucydides. The exhortations of Herwerden have incited him to publish, at once, his observations, instead of postponing them to some other occasion. He remarks that Herwerden's edition shows that emendations of the text of Thucydides consist very largely in the removal of *emblemata*; and though much has been done, still some gleanings have been left, and "equidem hoc gratiae et laudabilis negligentiae beneficio usus has spicas legi." One specimen only can be given, I 19, καὶ οἱ μὲν Λακεδαιμόνιοι οὐχ ὑποτελεῖς ἔχοντες φόρον τοῖς ξυνμάχους ἡγούντο, κατ' ὀλιγαρχίαν δὲ σφίσι μόνον ἐπιτηδείως ὅπως πολιτεύσουσι θεραπεύοντες. "Utrum Lacedaemonii artem imperandi ita exercebant ut sociis obsequium tribuerent, an socii maiestatem Lacedaemoniorum comiter conservabant? Magis cum utrorumque condicione consentaneum foret si pro θεραπεύοντες legeretur θεραπεύοντας. (!) Praeterea sic altera pars sententiae habere quod verbis οὐχ ὑποτελεῖς oppositum esset, et verba ὅπως πολιτεύσουσι sponte sua migrarent in marginem, unde in orationem scriptoris se intulerunt." Besides the fancied *emblemata*, which are here detected, we have a few notes of a more general character; the first of which is as follows: I 6. 2, σημείον δ' ἐστὶ ταῦτα τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐτι οὕτω

νεμόμενα κτέ. "Adverbium οὕτω indicat non ταῦτα sed τὰ veram esse lectionem."

At the end of this part (pp. 332-6), Herwerden begins some notes on the Republic of Plato. As a specimen may be quoted P. 337 D.: "τί οὖν, ἔφη (Thrasymachus), ἂν ἐγὼ δείξω ἐτέραν ἀποκρίσιν παρὰ πάσας ταύτας [περὶ δικαιοσύνης abesse malim] βελτίω [τούτων abesse malim], τί ἀξιούς παθεῖν; τί ἄλλο, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ἢ ὅπερ προσήκει πάσχειν τῷ μὴ εἰδότε; προσήκει δέ που μαθεῖν παρὰ τοῦ εἰδότεος· καὶ ἐγὼ οὖν τοῦτο ἀξιώ παθεῖν. Ἡδὺς γὰρ εἰ, ἔφη, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τῷ μαθεῖν καὶ ἀπότισον [i. ἀπότεισον] ἀργύριον. Stephanum requirentem πρὸς τὸ μαθεῖν recte quidem redarguit Stallbaum alludi dicens formulae indiciali τί ἀξιος παθεῖν ἢ ἀποτεῖσαι, sed tamen non temere Stephanus haesisse mihi videtur in vulgata scriptura. Quippe nimis inepte in Thrasymachi responso conjunguntur praemium et poena, nec fere dubito quin Plato eum fecerit respondentem: ἀλλὰ πρὸς τῷ παθεῖν (quemadmodum tu τὸ μαθεῖν vocas) καὶ ἀπότεισον ἀργύριον: *suavis es, si putas te ut vulgus damnatorum aut poena aut multa affectum iri; imo praeter panam pecuniam mihi solves*. Sic demum lepide haec dicta sunt." P. 360 D.: ἀληθὴ οἰόμενος, ὡς φησιν ὁ περὶ τοῦ τοιοῦτον λόγον λέγων. "Non est haec Graeca oratio. Sententia postulat: *quemadmodum contendit huius sermonis auctor, i. e. lingua Platonica: ὡς φησιν ὁ πατήρ τοῦ τοιοῦτον λόγον*. Cf. Theaet. 164 E; Symp. 177 D; Phaedr. 274 E. Posteaquam ex πῆρ, i. e. πατήρ, factum est περί, corrector addidit λέγων."

C. D. MORRIS.

HERMES, 1883.

No. III.

E. Maas, Tibullische Sagen. Tibullus holds an exceptional place amongst the Augustan poets in the use of myths. There is comparatively little mythological book-learning in his elegies. This trait, however, according to Maas, has a few exceptions. Maas argues that the Sibyl, who foretells things to Aeneas, in II 5, is not the Sibyl of Cumae, but a Trojan Sibyl, the product of the Hellenistic era, and probably coined by Pergamenian scholars. Attempting to get at the further tradition of this legend, Maas suggests the freedman of Sulla, L. Cornelius Alexander Polyhistor, as the sponsor of the fable to the Roman public.

E. Hiller, Die Tibullische Elegiensammlung. H. discusses, *e. g.*, the spurious Priapea, charging Scaliger with some hurried work. As regards the extensive borrowing of phrases and sentiments, in III 5, 15-20 (Lygdamus), from three passages of Ovid (Ars Am. II 669 sqq.; Trist. IV 10, 5; Am. II 14, 23), Hiller suggests that these lines were inserted by the author himself, in preparing a later copy of the poem as a present to some patron, Messalinus, *e. g.*

E. Albrecht, Beitrage zur Textkritik des Isaïos. On pp. 362-74 the author attempts to point out interpolations, partly such as were intended by their authors to supply apparent defects of the traditional text, partly those which originally were mere marginal notes, not designed as interpolations.

On pp. 374-81, H. proposes a number of changes, based purely on the observation of normal structure and phraseology.

A. Köhler (Nuremberg) some time ago, in the Vatican, discovered new MSS

of two Latin medical writers, *Pseudopliurus* and *Cassius Felix*, which he discusses on pp. 382-95.

U. Wilamowitz, Phaëthon. W. offers an attempt to reconstruct the Euripidean drama Phaëthon from the *reliquiae*. The current and familiar version of the legend is due to Ovid's elaboration. The fable of Euripides differs greatly. In it there is involved, apparently, a twofold action; one leading to the fall of Phaëthon, and the other leading to the discovery of the guilt of his mother Clymene. Merops, the ostensible father of Phaëthon and actual husband of Clymene, is presented as a man of coarse and overbearing demeanor, who proposes to marry his reputed son to an heiress of vast wealth. To escape from this necessity, Phaëthon resorts to the neighboring palace of Helios and insists upon receiving the fulfilment of a promise once given. In the beginning of his career, however, Phaëthon, without causing universal wreck, is hurled to the earth by Zeus, and Helios, who seems to have attended his son on a steed, at once resumes the guidance of his own chariot.

Robert, in a paper suggested by the preceding, discusses the Phaëthon legend in Hesiod, and states that the same is substantially preserved in Hyginus. References in Schol. on Odyssey λ, 325, p. 1689 (Eustathius), in Plato, Tim. 22, c; Plut. de Tranq. animi, p. 466, point to the Hesiodic version as being current and permanent.

M. Fränkel, Die Antidosis. Two new views on this odd contrivance of Attic law have been presented since Boeckh's time. Boeckh held that the offer of exchanging possessions or fortunes (*ἀντιδιδόναι*) under the Attic law could result in actual and permanent exchange; viz. in case a citizen (called upon to perform a *λειτουργία*) believed that a citizen of ampler means had been passed by, he challenged the latter to do one of two things: either to assume the liturgy, or to exchange estates, the latter process, of course, being carried out under the verdict of the proper courts.

In 1872, Dittenberger published a new view of *Antidosis*. He refuses to believe that actual or permanent exchange of estates on the part of the litigants was actually intended or carried into effect. The parties took charge of one another's property for the purpose merely of furnishing sworn affidavits to the court, concerning the assets of the other side. The court thereupon decided which of the two parties was the richer, and adjudged the latter liable to perform the liturgy. After this, each party resumed his own property. This is the view of *antidosis* which Fränkel supports in the present paper. At the same time, Fränkel attempts to invalidate both the view of Boeckh and the more recent one of Thalheim (Fleckeisen's Jhbb. 1877, p. 613), concurred in by Lipsius and Gilbert: the parties could take possession of one another's property in such a manner that he who was challenged as having a prior obligation to perform the liturgy could specify particular parcels of property which he wished to exchange, and the *antidosis* comprised two things: (1) a decision as to the proportion of relative possessions; (2) the actual exchange. Fränkel looks upon Thalheim's view as inferior to that of Boeckh.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Reasonable doubt may be entertained whether Fränkel has made out his own case. Demosth. (Mid. 79) seems to be plainly inconsistent with Fränkel's view; it is hard to see how temporary possession could enable the party offering *ἀντιδοσις* to remit suits instituted by the actual possessor, viz. suits concerning the property claimed in exchange.—E. G. S.



## No. IV.

Th. Bergk, *Philologische Paralipomena*. Notable among these is the second, "Ueber die Abfassungszeit der *Andromache*." The date which Bergk considers to accord best with the numerous political allusions and invectives of the play is 423 B. C. (Ol. 89, 2), when the exasperation of Athens against Sparta was at its height, at the time when in the one year's truce the Spartans refused to undo the work of Brasidas on the Thracian coast. Bergk's mastery of detail is very great, and special students of Euripides will do well to note this paper. Still, as regards method, it is noteworthy that even a veteran like Bergk manipulates the point of his argument, in the latter portion of his discourse, just as if it were a fixed and accepted fact, a subtle species of *petitio* which vitiates many a German classical paper.

The fourth paper is entitled "De Libello *περὶ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείας*," Bergk considers the much-discussed treatise very nearly contemporary with the *Birds* of Aristophanes, but esteems it a hopeless task to establish the author. His remarks are mainly critical and refer to definite passages in the text. Cobet's emendations of this text he values but lightly, and turns from them with the remark: "Sed taedet plura confidentiae exempla, quae Cobetus hic et aliis locis edidit, percensere."

Joh. Schmidt (Halle) reprints "The Medico-botanical Glossary of Siena." The terms explained in this vocabulary are mostly Greek, but written in Latin characters, abounding in corruption of orthography and transliteration. The explanations are mostly Latin, but Romance terminations are freely used also. Schmidt suggests that collections like the present one are based upon the alphabetical enumerations of the *φάρμακα ἀπλᾶ*, such as became customary, after the example of Galenus, with the medical writers who used Greek. The present compilation, according to Schmidt, is older than the 9th century A. D.<sup>1</sup>

Th. Kock (Weimar), *Ein Capitel aus der formalen Logik, angewandt auf Aristoteles und Platon*. After having set forth the nature of contradictory antitheses in which the two members exhaust the sum-total of possible predication (*principium exclusi tertii*), Aristotle (*De Interpretatione* 7, p. 176, line 16), gives the following example:

All human beings are white  
Not all human beings are white.

But as these two predications do not exclude a third, the example is false.

In Plato's *Protag.* 329c sqq., the aim of "Socrates" is to prove the following thesis: the cardinal virtues are substantially identical or indissoluble. In order to compel the assent of his principal interlocutor, "Socrates" confronts the latter with the following alternative: either personal probity (*δικαιοσύνη*) is pious, etc., or it is impious. But pious and impious, Kock holds, are not contradictory anti-

<sup>1</sup> The translations and explanations seem to mark a period of transition; we find the Latin genitive and also the periphrasis with *de*, e. g. No. 274 *semen oleastri*; 285 *Lauri folia*; 293 *uncula caballi*; 307 *grana uvae*, but 335 *flores de vite*; 409 *sugia de furno vitrario*. Romance forms the second declension are particularly frequent: 407 *atramento lucido*; 419 *gladiolo*; 346 *argento vivo*; 310 *serpullo*; 89 *spalto judaico*, etc., etc., but 201 *laurus*; 206 *capriolum*; 189 *sucus*; 253 *cetrium*, etc.

theses, excluding further predication. One of the two *contrary* antitheses may be denied to a given subject, but thereby the affirmation of the opposite (or *polaric* antithesis, as K. aptly terms it) is by no means a logical resultant. Formal logic, as Kock correctly states, does not determine the number of possibilities intervening between two "polaric" antitheses.

There cannot be any doubt as to the sincerity of Plato in this argumentation. This, the positive part of the dialogue, is free from the irony which permeates the greater part of the work. It seems to me that, in this view of the matter, Kock is right, as against Stallbaum, Bonitz and others.

F. Leo (Kiel), *Lectiones Plautinae*. Leo discusses detailed points of diction in which the Atticism of the originals is patent, or allusions which Plautus did not succeed in eliminating, *e. g.* in *Mostellaria* 1151: *optumas frustrationes dederis in comoediis*, viz. an opportunity for ridiculing them on the stage. In accordance with this purely Attic sense (for in the Roman transcription there was no place for personal ridicule) Leo changes 1149 sqq.: Th. Quid ego nunc faciam? Tr. Si amicus *Diphilo aut Philemoni es* (previous reading: "si amicus Demipho aut Philonides") dicito eis quo pacto tuos te servos ludificaverit: *optumas frustrationes dederis in comoediis*. This specimen may serve to indicate the purport of the paper.

Th. Schiche, In Ciceros Briefen an Atticus. The MSS tradition of books XII-XIII, Schiche premises, does not present the exact limits of each separate letter, nor are the letters found in strictly chronological order. It may be useful to present Schiche's results in this matter:

In 46 B. C., XII: 2; 5, §4; 3; 4; 5 down to *Lucilium sua*; 6; 7; 8; 11; 1.

In 45 B. C., XII: 13; 14; 15; 16; 18; 17; 18a; 19; 20; 12; 22; 23; 24; 25; 26; 27; 28; 29; 33; 30; 31, §3, + 32; 31, §1 and 2; 34 + 35, §1; 35, §2, + 36; 37; 38, §1 and 2; 38, §3 and 4; 39; 40; 42 down to *scribam ad te*; 41; 42 from *venerat mihi* on, + 43; 44 + 45, §1, down to *verbis*; 26; 46 + 47, §1, down to *poteris*; 47 *de mustela* down to 48 *esse*; 45 from *de Attica* on; 50; 48 from *sentiebam* on, + 49; 51; 52; 53. XIII: 2, 1, down to *Erote*; 1; 27; 28 + 29, §1, down to *oportere*; 29, §2 and 3, + 30, §1, down to *dederas*; 31; 30, §2 and 3, from *commodum* on; 2, §2 and 3, + 3; 32; 5; 33, §§1-3; 4; 6; 5, from *de Caelio* down to *expedies*; 7, 1; 7, 2; 9; 10; 11; 12; 13 + 14; 15 + 16; 17 + 18; 19; 21, §§4-7; 20; 22; 8; 33, §4 and 5; 23; 24 + 25, §1, down to *opus est*; 25, from *de Andromene* on; 35 + 36; 43 + 44; 38; 39; 40; 41; 34; 9; 10; 21, §§1-3; 47b; 48; 37; 45; 46; 47a; 49; 50; 51; 52; 42.

Otto Richter prints a few supplementary notes on the Clivus Capitolinus. The first of these is of general interest to scholars: W. Dörpfeld (*Mittheil. des Deutschen Archaeol. Inst. zu Athen*, VII 3, p. 277 sqq.) has shown that the Greek foot-measure was not = 0.308 millimeter, but 0.296, and promises to prove that in Rome, down to the third century B. C., there was current an Italian foot-measure of 0.278 m. Thus, then, the apparent discrepancy between the data of Dionysius, concerning the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, and the results of recent excavations may be explained.

E. G. SIHLER.

ARCHIV FÜR LATEINISCHE LEXIKOGRAPHIE UND GRAMMATIK. Erster Jahrgang. Heft 3.

This number is one of varied interest. It contains several articles which are based upon the material already received from the numerous collaborators: furnishing a good earnest of what may be expected in the future. A provisional specimen of the contemplated Thesaurus is given, pp. 427-36, embracing ? *Abacinus*-*Abalbus*.

The first article, pp. 321-8, entitled "Beobachtungen auf dem Gebiete des Mediciner-latein," is by G. Helmreich. He shows that, to prevent confusion between the plant *cucurbita* and the same word with the transferred meaning of cupping-glass, the latter was called by Celsus *cucurbitula*, by the elder Pliny *cucurbita medicinalis*, while Juvenal designates it as *ventosa cucurbita*, an expression evidently borrowed from the vulgar speech. In medical writers of a later date, *ventosa* alone is found, and this seems finally to have displaced *cucurbita*, passing over into the Romance languages, cf. Ital. and Span. *ventosa*, Fr. *ventouse*. The classical term for leech was *hirudo*, but Celsus used *sanguisuga*, which afterwards prevailed to such an extent that, in the fourth century, *hirudo* may be practically regarded as obsolete. Doubtless, the confusion with *hirundo*, in the popular pronunciation, contributed to this result. In the same way *cantabrum* supplanted *furfur*. A fine instance of the possibility of enriching the Latin vocabulary from Greek sources is furnished by the word *mulca*, evidently to be connected with *mulgeo*, ἀμέλλω, denoting a cooling drink made of sour milk. The word is given by Galen as Roman, and the earliest instance of its use in Latin is in Apicius, VII 308. Another cooling drink, perhaps of a less innocent nature, was *recentatum*, given by Alexander, of Tralles, as ῥεκεντάτον. *Girba*, a name for a kind of mortar, is shown to be of Semitic origin, and its repeated use by Cassius Felix furnishes further evidence in favor of his being an African.

On pp. 329-43, the editor, with his usual fulness and suggestiveness, discusses *pandus* and its derivatives, in the treatment of which the lexica are delightfully vague. Etymologically, *pandus* must be connected with *pandere*. To the same root belongs *Panda*, a name for the goddess of the harvest, so called, perhaps, as Wölfflin ingeniously suggests, because she causes the stalks to bend under the weight of the full ears. Tibullus speaks of *iuga panda*, but no author, before Sidonius, employs *aratrum pandum*. Vergil uses *pandas carinas*, a phrase derived from Ennius, while *puppis panda* belongs to the latest poetry. Many passages seem to prove that *pandus* properly denoted a concave rather than a convex curve. So Diomedes speaks of the sign for a short vowel as "*brevis virgula panda et contractior quasi c sursum spectans*." Accordingly, *nasum pandum* is a turned-up nose, a pug; and when Ovid applies the epithet to the unfortunate ass, reference is made, not to the belly, but to the back, sunk in from the weight of many burdens, just as Pliny, in speaking of the bees, says "*onustae remeant sarcina pandatae*." The word seems to have remained longest in use in the Spanish peninsula, and survives in the Span. *pando*, which the dictionary of the Spanish Academy of 1822 distinctly defines as concave. In a note, Otto Friedrich proposes to restore sense to Sergius Explan. in Donatum 4, 497, 2 K., by reading *peregrinum* for *femininum*.

Thielman contributes another instance of the use of the vulgar diminutive *satullus*, discussed by Buecheler on p. 103 of the *Archiv*.

J. H. Schmalz, pp. 344-9, shows how the use of the ablative absolute of the perfect deponent participle with an object, beginning in Sallust, with one example, was extended by Ovid and Livy and Valerius Maximus until, in the elder Pliny, it becomes quite frequent. The attitude of later writers, Christian and profane, toward this construction, is also stated, and an alphabetical list given of the verbs so used. The comparatively rare use of the plural of the perfect active potential and the perfect deponent is also discussed. The use of the perfect deponent potential in the singular is very rare, and Terence, *And.* 203, seems to furnish the earliest example: *ubivis facilius passus sim*, etc. Gittlbauer illustrates the value of verbal statistics by showing that Horatian usage requires us to read, in *Odes*, III 4, v. 43, *turbam*, and, in v. 47, *turmas*.

Wölfflin follows with an article on Rime in Latin, pp. 350-89, considering not so much the historical development, as the finished product. *Nātus* and *grātus* are correct rimes, *rātus* and *grātus* less correct. Rimes of inflexion merely, as of the infin. *are are, ere ere*, are excluded from the discussion; so, too, mere coincidence in a derivative suffix, and compounds having the same ending as *-ficus*, or *liticines* and *tubicines*. *Gemens* and *timens* constitute rimes, while *flens* and *gemens* do not; *res* and *spes* rime, so *ore* and *rubore*, since the nominatives differ, but not *victore* and *bellatore*, where the suffix is the same. Two positions are possible for the riming words. They are either immediately connected copulatively or disjunctively, *merus et verus, aut pictus aut fictus* (reimende Verbindungen), or each word closes a verse or half-verse in poetry, or parallel clauses in prose (Gliederreim or Satzreim). Some of the earliest formulae of incantation exhibit rimes of the first position, mostly inflexional. Plautus has not a few instances of strict rimes, although alliteration is a much more prominent feature of his verse: cf. *Merc.* prol. 25, *error, terror*; so Terence, *Ad.* 912, *solicitando et pollicitando*; *Eun.* 236, *pannis annisque*. Cornificius exhorts to moderation in the use of this figure. The example he gives is one afterwards well worn, *satius est uti regibus quam uti malis legibus*. Classical writers take, in the main, the same stand as Cornificius. In his later orations, Cicero uses rimes very sparingly, while in the letters which have a more familiar tone, they are more frequent. Caesar, Livy, Seneca and the elder Pliny yield but few instances. Classical poetry made little effort in this direction. Ovid, who might have been a ready rimer, chose not to be. Horace has *vera meraque virtus* and *videt ridetque Philippus*. Most of the examples of Homoeoteleuton, cited by the grammarians, are instances of inflexional rimes. Rime acquires a new importance among the African writers, and here Apuleius is most fruitful, the examples being so numerous that it is difficult to classify them. Tertullian and Augustine carry the development still further, perhaps under the influence of the Hebrew rimes of Scripture. From Africa the riming tendency passes over to Europe, and later Christian writers furnish new instances. Rimes of the second position (Glieder or Satzreime) occur in the Saturnian verse, but not as a marked feature. In a magic formula, preserved by Varro, we have *Terra pestem teneto, salus hic maneto*, with which may be compared Verg. *Ecl.* 8, 80, *Limus ut hic durescit, et*

*haec ut cera liquescit*. Only a few examples of this form of rime can be gleaned from Plautus, Ennius and Lucretius, from Horace, Ovid and Vergil; but Seneca could not resist the temptation to use them. Here, again, the African writers lay aside all restraint. Apuleius is especially fond of Satzreim, and Tertullian invents new applications of it. (The question whether there is any outside influence at work here must be left to Semitic scholars.) Rime thus came into the church, and continued to be cultivated in modern poetry. An alphabetical list of words found in riming combinations concludes the article.

On p. 389, Havet points out the existence of the adverb *quodie* (δ?) analogous to *hodie* in several inscriptions, and recognizes the adverb rather than *quo die* in Cicero, Div. in Caec. 41.

The next article, by Franz Seck, on the suffix *aster, astra, astrum*, shows what advantages the co-operative method has for the collection of material.

The same is true of the remaining articles by Wölfflin, on the desiderative verbs, on the use of *tenus* and of *abante*. The skill shown in the grouping of the facts, and the summing up of the results, leaves little to be desired.

In the Miscellen, numerous curious and difficult words are made the subject of brief remarks. The specimen of the Thesaurus given is so much superior, in point of completeness, to anything yet attempted in Latin lexicography, that we are filled with envy of the scholar of the future, let us hope the not very distant future, who shall have, at once, at his command a Thesaurus of the entire Latin language elaborated on the same scale.

M. WARREN.

JOURNAL ASIATIQUE. Série VIII, Tome II.

No. 2. Août-Septembre, 1883.

De Vogüé publishes the Greek and Aramaic texts of the great Palmyrene inscription, with translation, and a discussion of the commercial and political life of Palmyra in the first century of our era.

Guyard gives a new instalment of his Assyrian lexicographical notes.

Aymonier finishes his remarks on the old-Khmer inscriptions.

Joseph and Hartwig Derenbourg print fourteen unedited Sabeen inscriptions belonging to the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-lettres, with grammatical and historical remarks.

Senart points out the value of ancient Indian inscriptions for linguistic and literary chronology, and remarks that the Açoka inscriptions prove that their alphabets were not then employed for the notation of classic Sanskrit; that their orthography is nevertheless influenced by etymological knowledge, which must be referred to the oral cultivation of the Vedic-religious language; and that the different versions of the Açoka monuments belong orthographically to two systems, one, the more learned, represented by the inscriptions of Kapur di Giri and Girnar, the second, more purely Pracrit and popular, embracing all the other inscriptions.

Halévy proposes, as etymology of Ashpenaz, Dan. I 3, the Persian *aspanj*, "hotel," and supposes that the Hebrew writer transferred the name of this place to the officer who had control of it.

Imbault-Huart gives a fragment of a journey in the Chinese province Kiang-su:

Tome IV. No. 2. Février-Mars, 1884.

Léon Feer continues his Buddhist Studies with a dissertation on "how one becomes a preta." A preta is a dead man, one who has gone before (*pra ita*), but one who has returned alive, moves, speaks, has needs, and suffers. His crime is avarice, refusal to give to others what they need. He is visited with terrible punishments, and is delivered by gifts bestowed by his relatives on the needy.

Clément Huart illustrates the important position held by women at Bagdad under the Abbasside Califs, by sketches of three female musicians, one of whom was attached to the harem of the Calif Motawakkil, the second was the slave of a private man, and the third seems to have been free. With all the differences in their positions and characters—for the Calif's slave was faithful to her master even after his death, while the others led dissolute lives—they had in common their talent as poets and musicians, for which they were honored and sought after.

Abel Bergaigne continues his studies in the lexicon of the Rigveda.

J. Halévy defends his construction of the Libyan alphabet against objections made by recent writers.

Stanislas Guyard describes a new Assyrian verb-stem *harû*, with the signification "to set, or set one's self, across, crosswise, manifest, be manifested, set a seal across, seal."

Rubens Duval suggests that the district called by the Syrian lexicographers "the upper country," is not Dilmân, but the neighborhood of Šahrâzûr, the eastern part of Beth-Garmai.

Book notices. E. J. W. Gibb's Ottoman poems, translated into English verse, London, 1882, is warmly praised by Barbier-Meynard. Meynard expresses his gratitude to the Trustees of the British Museum for their Catalogue of Persian MSS, of which the third volume has now appeared.

C. de Harlez gives translations of some Manju texts, and earnestly commends the study of the language, especially as bearing on the comprehension of Chinese books and affairs.

No. 3. Avril-Mai-Juin.

Pognon completes his work on the Assyrian inscription of Meru-nirari I, correcting some details in his former papers, and adding a glossary of ideograms and words.

Clermont-Ganneau describes three spurious Phœnician monuments: 1. A scarabæus in the Louvre (No. 592 in Notice des antiquités assyriennes, etc.), with inscription, the whole copied from one in the British Museum (H. 433). 2. Bronze figurine in British Museum, marked 6-27-83-2, representing some quadruped, and containing the name Gadyaton. 3. Winged bull of terra cotta, sent to Clermont-Ganneau, by Mordtmann, from Constantinople, with the legend "Yehaumelek ben Yirpel," the name copied from this king's stele recently published by de Vogüé. Some of these forgeries seem to have been done in the East.

In his papers on Moslem numismatics and metrology, H. Sauvaire has now come to weights, which he here treats at great length. He begins by fixing the values of the principal legal weights, the dirhem at 3 gr. 0898, the mithkāl at 4 gr. 414, and then enumerates the others, giving references to authorities.

In chapter third of his study of the Piyadasi inscriptions, Senart discusses the edicts of Sahasarām, Rūpnāth, Bairat, and Bhabra, and the inscriptions of the grottoes of Barābar.

Stanislaus Guyard offers hypotheses, corrections and new suggestions for the Van inscriptions, with particular reference to Sayce's work.

Abel Bergaigne continues his studies in the lexicon of the Rigveda.

*Zendik* is a Moslem name for heretics, especially dualists and manichaeans, and is by the Arab Masudi derived from the Persian Zend, the name of the commentary on the Avesta. James Darmesteter points out that *zendik* is in fact borrowed from the Persian, but has nothing to do with the commentary; it is from the Avestan *zañda*, Pahlvi *zand*, "sorcery," and signifies "sorcerer."

C. H. TOY.